DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 226 CE 030 344

AUTHOR Greenan, James P.; And Others
TITLE Vocational/Special Education Personnel Development: An Analysis of Fiscal Year 1980 Annual State Plans. Policy Research and Resource Series: Document 7.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Urbana. Leadership Training Inst./Vocational and Special Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education (ED), Washington, D.C. Div. of Personnel Preparation.
PUB DATE Aug 81
GRANT G007900952
NOTE 71p.; For related documents see CE 030 343-345, ED 194 743-745, and ED 201 745.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Cooperation; Disabilities; Educational Finance; *Educational Needs; Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal State Relationship; Inservice Teacher Education; Labor Needs; Long Range Planning; Needs Assessment; Preservice Teacher Education; Program Development; *Special Education; *Staff Development; *Statewide Planning; *Teacher Education; *Vocational Education; Vocational Rehabilitation
IDENTIFIERS Comprehensive System for Personnel Development; Education for All Handicapped Children Act

ABSTRACT

Public Law 94-142 and other federal legislation mandate that all handicapped children receive a free and appropriate public education, including vocational education. In order to implement these provisions, personnel development of vocational and special education personnel is needed; therefore, each state that applies for federal funds must submit a three-year state plan that includes a Comprehensive System for Personnel Development (CSPD). A study of all state plans and several territory plans was undertaken to determine the extent to which vocational educators participate, and the extent to which vocational and career education content is present in the planning. The areas of CSPD concern included participatory input and implementation, needs assessment, preservice training, inservice training, incentives for inservice trainee participation, funding, inservice training participants, and vocational education manpower needs relative to educating handicapped learners. The findings and conclusions of the study suggest that vocational educators and vocational and career education content are not reflected extensively in comprehensive personnel planning in the states relative to the education of handicapped children and youth. The analysis also suggests that special education and vocational education continue not to coordinate their personnel preparation efforts to any significant extent. Recommendations include that vocational educators take a more active role in CSPD planning, that they be included in the special education inservice training, and that the needs assessment be used to revise personnel development programs. (KC)

ED208226

Vocational/Special Education Personnel Development: An Analysis of Fiscal Year 1980 Annual State Plans

Policy Research and Resource Series: Document 7

James P. Greenan
Research and Development Coordinator
Leadership Training Institute/
Vocational and Special Education
University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign

R. Brian Cobb
Research Assistant
Leadership Training Institute/
Vocational and Special Education
University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign

Laurie J. Batchelor
Research Assistant
Leadership Training Institute/
Vocational and Special Education
University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign

A Publication of the
LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE/
VOCATIONAL AND SPECIAL EDUCATION

College of Education
University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign

Sponsored by

Division of Personnel Preparation
Office of Special Education
U.S. Education Department

CE 030 344

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Janet Treichel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

August 1981

The contents of this publication were developed under grant number G007900952 from the Division of Personnel Preparation, Office of Special Education, U.S. Education Department. However, these contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the agency, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

Foreword

The enactment of Public Law 94-142 created major changes in the context and delivery of special education services throughout the nation. The framers of the legislation clearly recognized the role of and critical need for personnel training efforts in bringing about these changes. The extent to which Public Law 94-142 is fully implemented continues to depend heavily upon the knowledge, expertise, and competencies of teachers, parents, related services personnel, counselors, and other personnel. Assuring that a free and appropriate public education is available to all handicapped children is contingent upon the effective delivery of appropriate preservice and inservice training and technical assistance to those responsible for implementing the Act.

One of the major provisions of Public Law 94-142 was the requirement for local and state education agencies to develop a "Comprehensive System for Personnel Development (CSPD)" as part of their annual plans for education of the handicapped. The CSPD is essentially a state planning document which includes a description of programs and procedures for the development and implementation of comprehensive personnel development. Generally, the content of the CSPD includes: inservice training provided to general educators, special educators, related services personnel, and support personnel; procedures to insure that all personnel necessary to carry out Public Law 94-142 are qualified, and that the activities sufficient to carry out the personnel development plan are scheduled; and effective procedures for acquiring and disseminating to teachers and administrators of programs for handicapped children significant information derived from educational research, demonstration, and similar projects, and for adopt-

ing, where appropriate, promising educational practices and materials developed through those projects.

The need for comprehensive vocational education services for all handicapped individuals has also been acknowledged as an integral part of special education and Public Law 94-142 (Federal Register, September 25, 1978). Further, it has been noted that special educators generally lack expertise in preparing their students for vocational and career-oriented objectives. Conversely, vocational educators generally lack expertise in dealing with the unique learning and behavioral problems of handicapped adolescents (Clark and Evans, 1977). In many states, progress has been made in bringing these two groups of professionals together in practice as well as in training programs.

In September of 1980 the staff of the Leadership Training Institute/ Vocational and Special Education considered the prospect of examining the CSPDs of the states. This was considered one vehicle for determining the extent to which issues related to vocational and career education for handicapped youth were being addressed, and the extent to which vocational and career educators were being included in CSPD efforts. Following the development of a prospectus for the study and several positive responses from teacher educators and SEA personnel, the study was initiated. The resultant report provides a comprehensive analysis of all of the CSPDs developed by the states for Fiscal Year 1980. Significant recommendations are made for improving the focus upon vocational and career education within CSPD activities at the state level.

The LTI is indebted to Dr. James P. Greenan, Research and Development Coordinator for managing and conducting the study. R. Brian Cobb and Laurie J. Batchelor were instrumental in the collection and analysis of

the data. The reviewers of the draft report provided numerous helpful and insightful comments: Ms. Kay Robinson, Special Education Specialist, Illinois State Board of Education; Dr. Marc E. Hull, Assistant Director of Special Education, Vermont State Department of Education; Dr. George Hagerty, Division of Personnel Preparation, Office of Special Education; U.S. Department of Education; Dr. Leonard C. Burrello, Director of the National Inservice Network, Indiana University; Dr. M. Stephen Lilly, Associate Dean, College of Education, University of Illinois; and Dr. Richard C. Schofer, Chairman, Department of Special Education, University of Missouri. The LTI staff is also extremely grateful to the Council for Exceptional Children for their assistance in obtaining the CSPDs from each state. In addition, the staff would also like to thank Ms. Nancy Schum for her effort in typing and Ms. Barbara Macikas for proofreading the report.

L. Allen Phelps, Director
Leadership Training Institute/
Vocational and Special Education

Table of Contents

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Objectives of the Study	5
Research Questions	6
Significance of the Study	7
RESEARCH PROCEDURES	9
Instrumentation	9
Population	9
Data Collection	10
Data Analysis	10
FINDINGS	11
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	37
Summary	37
Conclusions	41
Recommendations	44
REFERENCES	51
APPENDIX	53

Introduction

Within the past eight years several significant pieces of federal legislation and initiatives have established the rights of all handicapped learners to equal educational opportunities (Public Law 93-112, Sections 503 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975; Public Law 94-482, the Education Amendments of 1976: Title II-Vocational Education). The successful implementation of Public Law 94-142, particularly the Individualized Education Programming (IEP), Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), and Procedural Safeguards provisions will require intensive preservice and inservice training for educational personnel. Training all educators including special education, regular education, vocational education, and other professional and support personnel, is an important activity for assuring that all handicapped learners receive a "free and appropriate public education" as mandated by the law.

To guarantee that the provisions of Public Law 94-142 are met, each state which applies for federal funds must submit a three-year state plan for special education that includes a Comprehensive System for Personnel Development (CSPD) (Public Law 94-142, Sections 613(a)(3), 614(a)(1)(c)(i)). The 1977 Rules and Regulations (CFR 45121a.380-387) which govern the terms of compliance specify several components that a CSPD must contain to assure that all handicapped learners receive quality instruction and related services. These components currently include: Participatory Input and Implementation, Needs Assessment, Inservice Training, Preservice Training, Dissemination and Adoption of Promising Practices, Evaluation, and Technical Assistance to Local Education Agencies (LEA).

Public Law 94-142 has unequivocally established that every handicapped youth must be afforded the opportunity to participate in free and appropriate vocational education programs. The law specifically states that:

> "'Vocational Education' means organized educational programs which are directly related to the preparation of individuals for paid or unpaid employment, or for additional preparation for a career requiring other than a baccalaureate or advanced degree. 121a.14(b)(3)."

> "...vocational education is 'included as special education' if it consists of specially designed instruction, at no cost to the parents, to meet the unique needs of a handicapped child. 121a.14(a)(3)."

> "Each public agency shall take steps to insure that its handicapped children have available to them the variety of educational programs and services available to nonhandicapped children in the area served by the agency, including ... industrial arts, consumer and homemaking education, and vocational education. (121a.305)."

These ideas have been directly reinforced by Public Law 94-482 which states that handicapped students must be placed in regular vocational classes to the "maximum extent possible." In addition, the law provides 10% set-aside funds to be used for the excess costs of delivering vocational instruction and support services to handicapped learners. Therefore, it is important and essential that vocational educators be included in comprehensive state planning for personnel preparation related to the education of handicapped children and youth. Further, the Rules and Regulations of Public Law 94-142 require a broad-based participation in the development, review, and annual updating of the CSPD. This suggests that vocational educators should be included in comprehensive personnel planning. It is equally important that vocational and career education content be a part of the personnel training provided to special and regular educators. However, the extent to which comprehensive personnel development initiatives succeed will depend upon collaborative efforts among vocational education and special education, their state education agencies (SEA), and LEAs, and institutions of higher education (IHE) (Burrello and Baker, 1980).

Although progress has been made by the states, several national studies indicate that personnel preparation continues to be a critical problem area (Phelps and Thornton, 1979; Howard, 1979; Greenan and Phelps, 1980). Further, the Interim Report to Congress (1979) cited two major problems that have implications for personnel preparation:

> "Annual program plans from the states indicate that a lack of inservice training, particularly for teachers of children with low-incidence handicapping conditions, continues to limit the ability of state and local agencies to offer a full continuum of alternatives to all handicapped students...p. 40."
>
> "...Approximately one-third of the teachers employed yearly by local school districts to teach the handicapped have not been trained as special educators...p. 40."

Clearly, these problems point to the need for improved personnel preparation activities and initiatives.

Other investigations also cite the need for improved personnel preparation. Rude (1978) and Schofer and Duncan (1978) found that personnel development planning in most states was incomplete and lacking comprehensiveness. In a review of the 1979-80 state plans for special education, Horn and Cave (1980) concluded that several state plans needed improvements in such areas as CSPD design, evaluation design, CSPD implementation, dissemination, needs assessment, and identifying inservice training needs. In addition, Schofer and Duncan (1980) identified three problems that tend to inhibit progress in CSPD efforts at all levels: a lack of understanding of the importance of the CSPD, limited time and personnel, and fiscal restrictions.

In summary, there appears to be a void in the literature pertaining to the involvement of vocational education personnel in comprehensive personnel development for serving handicapped learners. In addition, vocational and career education content seems to be only tangentially included

in existing personnel training plans for special educators and regular educators. Further, minimal information is available which focuses on planning, designing, and delivering programs that will make a difference in the quality of the education received by handicapped youth. Recent research has not directly addressed these concerns. However, as the provisions, concepts, and ideals of Public Law 94-142 are further implemented and handicapped learners continue to be placed into vocational programs, preservice and inservice training for special, regular, and vocational education personnel will become increasingly important.

Statement of the Problem

The central problem investigated in this study was to determine the extent to which vocational educators participate, and vocational and career education content is present in the Fiscal Year 1980 Comprehensive Systems of Personnel Development (CSPD) of 49 states, the District of Columbia, and two trust territories (Guam and the Virgin Islands). The areas of CSPD concern included: (1) participatory input and implementation, (2) needs assessment, (3) preservice training, (4) inservice training, (5) incentives for inservice trainee participation, (6) funding, (7) inservice training participants, and (8) vocational education manpower needs relative to educating handicapped learners.

It was not the intent of this study to examine the extent to which state CSPDs included dissemination and adoption of promising practices, evaluation, and technical assistance to LEAs. In addition, this study did not attempt to assess the extent to which the components of the CSPDs were actually implemented nor the perceptions of LEA and SEA personnel as to CSPD effectiveness. This study specifically examined the extent to

which the states, through the CSPD provisions of Public Law 94-142, systematically and comprehensively plan for the (1) professional development of vocational education personnel, and (2) professional development of other educational personnel concerning vocational and career education content relative to the education of handicapped children and youth.

Objectives of the Study

In order to resolve the central problem of this study, the following objectives were developed:

I. Assess the extent to which vocational educators or their representatives participate in the development and implementation of the CSPDs in the states.

II. Determine if the needs of vocational educators are assessed relative to the education of handicapped children and youth.

III. Assess the extent to which preservice training programs exist in the areas of vocational/special education and/or career preparation.

IV. Determine the nature and extent of the inservice training initiatives for (a) all educators and support personnel including vocational educators, and (b) in the content area of vocational/special education for personnel in the states relative to the education of handicapped children and youth.

V. Identify the incentives that are used in the states to enhance inservice trainee participation.

VI. Determine the funding sources for inservice training activities and programs which include vocational/special education content as a primary training component, or in which vocational educators are specifically identified as participants.

VII. Identify the number of personnel currently receiving inservice training relative to the education of handicapped children and youth.

VIII. Identify the number of additional vocational educators that are currently needed to meet the "free and appropriate public education" requirements under Public Law 94-142.

Research Questions

In order to achieve the major objectives of this study the following research questions were developed:

PARTICIPATORY INPUT AND IMPLEMENTATION

1. What groups, agencies, or organizations, including vocational educators or their representatives, serve as members on the statewide manpower planning council (CSPD Committee) or its equivalent in the states?

2. To what extent do individuals from the groups, agencies, or organizations, including vocational education personnel, participate in the development, review, refinement, and annual updating of the states' comprehensive systems of personnel development?

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

3. How do SEAs assess the needs of educators and support personnel, including vocational educators, relative to the education of handicapped children and youth?

PRESERVICE TRAINING

4. To what extent do paraprofessional, undergraduate, and graduate programs respond to the preservice training needs identified through systematic needs assessments conducted by the states?

5. Do the states' CSPDs include a description of paraprofessional, undergraduate, and graduate preparatory programs in the areas of vocational/special education and/or career preparation?

INSERVICE TRAINING

6. What is the nature and extent of the inservice training initiatives relative to the education of handicapped children and youth for (a) all educators and support personnel including vocational educators, and (b) in the content area of vocational/special education for personnel in the states?

INCENTIVES FOR INSERVICE TRAINEE PARTICIPATION

7. What incentives are utilized to enhance inservice trainee participation in the states?

FUNDING

8. What are the funding sources for the inservice training programs and activities relative to the education of handicapped children and youth (a) for all education and support personnel in the states, and (b) for programs which include vocational/special education content as a primary training component or for vocational educators who are specifically identified as participants?

INSERVICE PARTICIPANTS

9. How many personnel currently receive inservice training relative to the education of handicapped children and youth in the states?

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION MANPOWER NEEDS

10. How many additional vocational educators (teachers, work-study coordinators) are currently needed by the states to meet the "free and appropriate public education" requirements under Public Law 94-142?

Significance of the Study

Personnel preparation and planning continues to be a major problem facing vocational and special education relative to the education of handicapped children and youth in the states. As the provisions and ideals of Public Law 94-142 are further implemented, the need for preservice and inservice training will increase. To assure that the goals of the law are achieved, the design and delivery of comprehensive and effective personnel development activities is of paramount importance.

This study can contribute to the body of knowledge concerning personnel preparation and development in vocational and special education by providing data and information which describe the extent to which states are presently addressing the area of personnel preparation as it pertains to vocational education for handicapped learners. The data and information should be helpful to policy makers including state directors of vocational

and special education, state certification board officers, CSPD manpower planning council members, state CSPD officers, and others for making future personnel development plans and decisions relative to preparing educational personnel to work with handicapped learners. Effective SEA planning and practices can serve as models for LEAs. In addition, this study could provide data for making revisions of federal and state legislation, and justifying federal and state appropriations. The information should also be helpful to higher education personnel, LEA personnel, parents and advocacy groups, handicapped consumers, and other groups and agencies who should be involved in collaborative personnel development in the states.

Research Procedures

Several research procedures were used to achieve the major objectives and answer the research questions of this study. The procedures included the development of an instrument, selection of a population, collection of data, and analysis of the data. The research procedures occurred over a five-month period.

Instrumentation

A survey-type instrument was developed to collect the necessary data in this study (see Appendix A). Ten questions were developed from the research questions and composed the items on the survey instrument. The items were of differing formats. For example, some questions were open-ended, others asked the respondent to indicate yes/no or check appropriate items, and one question required numerical data to be recorded on a chart. Included on each instrument were spaces to indicate the state and alongside each question were spaces to indicate the page number of the CSPD from which the information was derived. The instrument was not designed to survey the individual states (i.e., state CSPD officers). Rather, the "survey" instrument was used internally by the investigators to collect and analyze the necessary data from the states' CSPDs.

Population

The population for this study included all states and trust territories which had Fiscal Year 1980 State Plans for Special Education (49 states, District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands). Each of the 52 states

and territories had a State Plan including a CSPD component as required by Public Law 94-142. Therefore, the entire population of 52 CSPDs were reviewed in this study.

Data Collection

The CSPDs from each of the states and territories were requested from the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC). Forty-nine of the 52 CSPDs were obtained. The remaining three were received directly from the respective state CSPD officers. After obtaining all the CSPDs, a secondary analysis was conducted and the survey instrument was used to collect the data. The data collection process occurred over a three-month period.

Data Analysis

The data obtained from each of the CSPDs were analyzed collectively across states. Descriptive data tables were generated for each of the research questions. Each table reports variables, frequencies, and percentages. The tables provide an overall view of the extent to which the states are responding to comprehensive planning for personnel preparation and development in the areas of participatory input and implementation, needs assessment, preservice training, inservice training, incentives for inservice trainee participation, funding, inservice participants, and vocational education manpower needs.

Findings

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which vocational educators participate and vocational and career education content is present in the Fiscal Year 1980 Special Education Comprehensive Systems of Personnel Development of the states. Fifty-two CSPDs were reviewed. The data that were collected specifically focused on the major objectives and research questions developed in this study. Therefore, the following discussion of the findings and Tables 1-10 are concerned with the major objectives and research questions of this study.

Participatory Input and Implementation

Objective 1: Assess the extent to which vocational educators or their representatives participate in the development and implementation of the CSPDs in the states.

1. What groups, agencies, or organizations, including vocational educators or their representatives, serve as members on the statewide manpower planning council (CSPD Committee) or its equivalent in the states?

The groups, agencies, or organizations which serve as members on statewide manpower planning councils are presented in Table 1. Also presented are the numbers of states which indicated a particular group, agency, or organization, and the percent response which specifies the proportion or percentage of the 52 states and territories that indicated any one of the agencies, groups, or organizations listed in the table.

Each of the 52 CSPDs indicated at least one agency, group, or organization which serves on their respective statewide manpower planning councils. Higher education personnel most frequently appear on the planning councils or CSPD committees. Approximately 83% of the states have persons

TABLE 1

GROUPS, AGENCIES, OR ORGANIZATIONS WHICH SERVE AS MEMBERS ON STATEWIDE MANPOWER PLANNING COUNCILS

Agency, Group, or Organization	Number of States Identified	Percent Response
Higher education personnel	43	82.69%
State education agency personnel	40	76.92%
Special education (16)		
Elementary and secondary education (8)		
Vocational education (6)		
State certification board (5)		
Pupil personnel services (5)		
State board of ihgher education (2)		
Research and evaluation (2)		
State board for community colleges (1)		
Local education agency personnel	38	73.08%
Special education administrators (11)		
Regular education administrators (10)		
Special education teachers (10)		
Regular education teachers (8)		
Vocational educators (4)		
Support service personnel (3)		
Representatives from other state agencies	30	57.69%
State advisory council on special education (8)		
Department of public health (8)		
Department of mental health (7)		
Regional resource center (7)		
Vocational rehabilitation (4)		
Governor's committee on the handicapped (2)		
Department of corrections (2)		
State council for exceptional children (1)		
State legislature (1)		
Advocacy groups	25	48.08%
Groups unique to their respective state (12)		
Council for exceptional children (6)		
Association for retarded citizens (4)		
Association of citizens with learning disabilities (3)		
Parents	24	46.15%
Professional associations	19	36.54%
Handicapped consumers	10	19.23%
State institution personnel	8	15.39%

N=52

representing higher education on their CSPD committees. State education agency personnel are also active in planning personnel development activities. Nearly 77% of the states indicated SEA participation from personnel groups including special education, elementary and secondary education, and vocational education. Local education agency personnel including groups such as special education and regular education teachers and administrators were reported by 73% of the states. The extent of specificity of the groups and subgroups indicated in the CSPDs differed from state to state. For example, while 30 states indicated that representatives from "other state agencies" are involved in comprehensive personnel development, some states listed more than one subgroup while other states listed no specific subgroups. Advocacy groups, parents, professional association representatives, handicapped consumers, and state institution personnel appear to be involved in comprehensive personnel planning and development in less than one half of the states.

Ten states indicated that vocational educators or their representatives, such as professional organizations or related agencies serve as members on the statewide manpower planning council, while forty-two states did not. Vocational educators were only specified as a subgroup by six states under SEA personnel and four states under LEA personnel. Participation of vocational educators in higher education on statewide manpower planning councils seems virtually nonexistent. Generally, while several different groups, agencies, or organizations are currently participating on statewide personnel development committees in the states, vocational educators or their representatives are usually not included.

2. To what extent do individuals from the groups, agencies, or organizations, including vocational education personnel, partici-

pate in the development, review, refinement, and annual updating of the states' comprehensive systems of personnel development?

The methods of participation in the development, review, refinement, and annual updating of the states' comprehensive systems of personnel development are presented in Table 2. Also presented is the number of states which indicated a particular method of participation and the percent response which specifies the proportion or percentage of the 52 states that indicated any one of the methods of participation listed in the table.

Each of the 52 states indicated at least one method by which various groups, agencies, or organizations participate in the CSPD process. Thirty-eight states listed the CSPD committee as one method for various groups to participate and provide input into the CSPD. Meetings, conferences, or seminars were reportedly used by 46% of the states. Field-based task forces, special education state advisory councils, other advisory committees and public hearings were each reported as methods by about one third of the states. Surveys, dissemination, and other methods were less frequently listed.

Thirteen states indicated that individuals affiliated with vocational education also participated by providing input into the comprehensive systems of personnel development, while 39 states did not. Thus 25% of the states appear to have vocational educators participate in the CSPD process. Those states which had vocational educators participate did not state or describe the extent of participation. In summary, the states appear to have a broad array of methods by which various groups may provide input into developing, reviewing, refining, and updating their CSPDs annually. However, vocational educators do not appear to be frequent participants, and when they are, they do not seem to have an active role.

TABLE 2

METHODS OF PARTICIPATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT, REVIEW, REFINEMENT, AND ANNUAL UPDATING OF THE STATES' COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEMS OF PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT

Method of Participation	Number of States Identified	Percent Response
CSPD committee	38	73.08%
Meetings, conferences, or seminars for input in the CSPD	24	46.15%
Field-based task forces for developing or reviewing particular aspects of the CSPD	19	36.54%
State advisory council on special education (P.L. 94-142)	16	30.77%
Advisory committees other than a state CSPD committee	16	30.77%
Public hearings	16	30.77%
Surveys	13	25.00%
Provide information through existing dissemination systems	12	23.08%
Others (forums, steering committees, formal and informal interviews, annual program plan review, ad hoc advisory committees input from local directors of special education)	9	17.31%

N = 52

Needs Assessment

Objective II: Determine if the needs of vocational educators are assessed relative to the education of handicapped children and youth.

3. How do SEAs assess the needs of educators and support personnel, including vocational educators, relative to the education of handicapped children and youth?

The methods of needs assessment described in the CSPDs are presented in Table 3. Also presented is the number of states which indicated a particular method of needs assessment, and the percent response of states which indicated any one of the methods of needs assessment listed in the table.

Each of the 52 states and territories indicated at least one method of needs assessment. Surveys represented the most frequently used method to determine and prioritize LEA personnel needs. Forty-seven states included surveys as a method of needs assessment. Traditionally, LEA surveys have been focused on the inservice needs of teachers, supervisors, and administrators. These surveys commonly make use of Likert-type rating scales as a means of asking personnel to rate their proficiencies and/or indicate their need for inservice training. Other surveys may entail interviews or different data collection methods. Routine LEA personnel reports, findings from compliance monitoring of LEAs, and studies of personnel competencies were each noted as being or having been conducted by more than one third of the states. Less frequently indicated by the states were such needs assessment methods as personnel projections, data from personnel training programs, formal or informal contact with LEA personnel, and review of LEA inservice requests or local personnel and program development plans.

TABLE 3

METHODS BY WHICH SEAs ASSESS THE NEEDS OF EDUCATORS AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL RELATIVE TO THE EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Method of Needs Assessment	Number of States Identified	Percent Response
Surveys to determine LEA priority personnel needs	47	90.39%
Routine LEA personnel reports	23	44.23%
Findings from compliance monitoring of LEAs	20	38.46%
Study of competencies required of personnel to implement Public Law 94-142	18	34.62%
Personnel projections from LEA applications for Public Law 94-142	16	30.77%
Data on numbers and qualification of graduates of personnel training programs	12	23.08%
Formal or informal contact with LEA personnel	12	23.08%
Review of LEA inservice requests and local personnel and program development plans	12	23.08%
Parents/advocacy groups/advisory councils input	9	17.31%
Interviews	9	17.31%
Analysis of child find and census data to determine changing student needs	9	17.31%
Workshop evaluations	6	11.54%
Meetings with local special education coordinators	5	9.62%
Analysis of university programs and certification standards	4	7.69%
Analysis of individualized education plans	1	1.92%

N = 52

Twelve states indicated that they explicitly assess the needs of vocational educators relative to the education of handicapped children and youth, while 40 states did not. Only 23% of the CSPDs specifically plan for the personnel development of vocational educators. It should also be noted that some CSPD's have vocational educators listed as a target audience for inservice training or in CSPD development, but do not specifically state if the needs of this population are assessed. This may suggest that deliberately or not, more vocational educators are having their needs assessed, but the extent of specificity or planning is not expressed. Based on the available data, the states are apparently using a relatively wide array of needs assessment methods. However, for the most part, the needs of vocational educators are not being adequately assessed relative to the education of handicapped children and youth.

Preservice Training

Objective III: Assess the extent to which preservice training programs exist in the areas of vocational/special education and/or career preparation.

4. To what extent do paraprofessional, undergraduate, and graduate programs respond to the preservice training needs identified through systematic needs assessments conducted by the states?

The modes by which the paraprofessional, undergraduate, and graduate programs respond to the preservice training needs established as a result of systematic needs assessments conducted by the states are presented in Table 4. Forty-five of the 52 CSPDs indicated the modes by which the personnel preparation programs respond to the needs expressed in statewide needs assessments. However, 19 of the states or about 37% of

TABLE 4

MODES BY WHICH THE PARAPROFESSIONAL, UNDERGRADUATE, AND GRADUATE PROGRAMS RESPOND TO THE PRESERVICE TRAINING NEEDS ESTABLISHED AS A RESULT OF SYSTEMATIC NEEDS ASSESSMENTS CONDUCTED BY THE STATES

Response Mode	Number of States Identified	Percent Response
Implicit, not explicit	19	36.54%
Needs assessment data is disseminated to and used by IHEs (e.g., special education and vocational education departments, and dean's committees) for future planning of personnel development programs and activities including: number of people to be trained; determine effectiveness, adequacy, and resource capability of IHEs; what groups will receive priority preservice training; course development and adaptation; skill development; and teaching in special education areas.	18	34.62%
Representatives of IHEs, LEAs, SEAs, CSPD committees, and/or state certification boards collaborate and coordinate their preservice planning in determining course and program offerings, needs assessment data, curriculum designs, shared practicum sites, product development, placement data reports; and certification and accreditation.	13	25.00%

N = 52
n = 45

the CSPDs did not specify how needs assessment data are used to improve and expand personnel preparation programs. The information was implicit and very vague. Several states indicated that they communicate the information to universities and colleges to assist in developing and maintaining programs. Other states indicated a collaborative approach in using the needs assessment information. A few states used both of these modes.

In summary, based on the data, the states do not appear to be effectively planning for using comprehensive needs assessment data for developing, implementing, and evaluating paraprofessional, undergraduate, and graduate programs. Several states are involved in needs assessment, as indicated previously. However, the states may not be able to effectively interpret or translate the information and use it in the "bigger picture" of personnel planning and preparation. This section of the CSPDs needs to have greater presence and specificity. In addition, the collaborative efforts of university and college personnel with SEA and other personnel in the planning process is a key to the effective use of needs assessment data for developing personnel preparation programs relative to the education of handicapped children and youth.

5. Do the states' CSPDs include a description of paraprofessional, undergraduate, and graduate preparatory programs in the areas of vocational/special education and/or career preparation?

The descriptions of paraprofessional, undergraduate, and graduate preparatory programs in the areas of vocational/special education and/or career preparation are presented in Table 5. Six of the 52 CSPDs or approximately 12% of the states included a description of paraprofessional, undergraduate, and graduate preparatory programs. Six different brief

TABLE 5

DESCRIPTIONS OF PARAPROFESSIONAL UNDERGRADUATE, AND GRADUATE PREPARATORY PROGRAMS IN THE AREAS OF VOCATIONAL/SPECIAL EDUCATION AND/OR CAREER PREPARATION

Description of Paraprofessional, Undergraduate, and Graduate Preparatory Programs	Number of States Identified	Percent Response
..."Career/Occupational/Vocational/Job..., ...Vocational Education general requirements..., ...School guidance/counseling certificate..., ...Vocational educators requirement for advanced guidance supervision certificate..."	1	1.92%
"Program on Vocational/Special Education currently is being developed by department of Special Education"	1	1.92%
Brief Statement	1	1.92%
"Projections indicate no need for preservice, emphasis on inservice."	1	1.92%
"Special education preservice personnel have components which more fully develop competencies across the K-12 spectrum including components to deliver a program with a work experience and vocational training emphasis."	1	1.92%
"Integrated K-12 special education/ vocational education program..."	1	1.92%

N = 52
n = 6

excerpts are presented. The available descriptions of programs provided by some states were vague or lacked substance. Therefore, based on the information in the CSPDs, it can only be assumed that the states have been generally slow in planning and developing paraprofessional, undergraduate, and graduate programs in vocational/special education for handicapped children and youth. However, it should be noted that several universities and colleges in various states have developed vocational/special education courses and programs that are operational and may not appear in the CSPDs (University of New Mexico, 1978; Brock, 1979; National Association for Vocational Education Special Needs Personnel, 1980). Nevertheless, this area of personnel planning and preparation needs to be assigned increased collaborative attention by state planning personnel. Successful vocational and career preparation of handicapped children and youth is dependent to a great extent on the effective preparation and certification of special and vocational education teachers, paraprofessionals, supervisors, and administrators.

Inservice Training

Objective IV: Determine the nature and extent of the inservice training initiatives for (a) all educators and support personnel including vocational educators, and (b) in the content area of vocational/special education for personnel in the states relative to the education of handicapped children and youth.

6. What is the nature and extent of the inservice training initiatives relative to the education of handicapped children and youth for (a) all educators and support personnel including vocational educators, and (b) in the content area of vocational/special education for personnel in the states?

The types of inservice training programs and activities provided to educators and support personnel relative to the education of handicapped

children and youth are presented in Table 6a. Each cell in the table represents individual states which have reported data describing the content of inservice training and the groups to receive inservice training. Because data are aggregated across the target audiences or content areas, some overlap among states may occur. For example, some states reported more than one target group receiving inservice training in a particular content area. The cells containing unidentified content areas or target audiences reveal no overlap among states.

The findings indicated six primary areas in which personnel were receiving inservice training. These include: individualized education programs, least restrictive environment, implementation of Public Law 94-142, due process, assessment, and interagency cooperation.

Due to a lack of specificity, 46 responses were unidentifiable with respect to the content of inservice training programs and activities for identified target audiences. The findings aiso indicated that regular educators and special educators were the most frequent target groups receiving training; however, in the states reporting data a total of 280 programs did not specify the target groups to receive the training.

Individualized education programs was the inservice content area most frequently identified by the states. Twenty-nine states did not identify the target groups which receive IEP inservice training, while six states identified special educators, 3 states regular educators, 2 states administrators, and 1 state parents and advocacy groups. Some overlap may have occurred when states identified more than 1 target group.

Least restrictive environment and assessment were the second most frequently identified inservice content areas with 32 responses each. Thirty

TABLE 6a

TYPES OF INSERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES PROVIDED TO EDUCATORS AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL RELATIVE TO THE EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN AND YOUTH IN THE STATES

Content	Target Audiences: Unidentified	Special Educators	Regular Educators	Administrators	Support Personnel	Paraprofessionals	Parents and Advocacy Groups	Surrogate Parents	Psychologists	Due Process Officers	Volunteers	Others (SEA, Physicians and Corrections)
Unidentified		4	9	6	1	5	7	4	1	5	1	3
Implementation of PL 94-142	17		1	3		1						
Individualized Education Programs	29	6	3	2			1					
Least Restrictive Environment	30		2									
Due Process	16	1		1			1					
Interagency Cooperation	16	3	2	3			1					1
Child Find and Referral Procedures	3											
Eligibility, Screening, and Admissions	8											1
Assessment	26	4	1									1
Instructional Materials	6		1									
Instructional Strategies	9	1	4									
Upgrading Skills		4	2		2	1	1			1		
Record Keeping	2											
Classroom Management	7	1	1									
Communication Skills	2	1	2									
Sensitivity Training	1											
Special Education Programs	6	3	1	5								1
Basic Skills	1	1	1									
Early Childhood Programs	10											1
Physical Education Programs	7		3									
Planning, Implementing and Evaluating In-Service Programs	6	2	2	3			1					
Program Evaluation	6			1								
Community Resources	2											
Certification	1	2										
Transportation	1											
Dissemination of Information	2											
Paraprofessional Training	2											
Parent and Advocacy Training	8			2			2			1		1
Use of Surrogate Parents	5											
Advisory Committees	2											
Handicapping Conditions	8	1	1	1		1	1					1
Educable Mentally Handicapped	1	2										
Learning Disabled	4	1	1									1
Emotionally Disturbed	7	1	1	1								
Speech Impaired	3	2	2									
Visually Impaired Blind	2	1										
Hearing Impaired Deaf	2	1	1									
Autism	1											
Severely Handicapped	11	1	2	1			1					
Bilingual Education	2	1	1									

N = 52

responses were unidentified with respect to the target groups receiving LRE training and 26 responses were unidentified regarding those groups receiving assessment training.

The general area of career/vocational/special education was the most frequently identified content area relative to the inservice training provided to vocational education personnel and/or programming in the area of vocational/special education (see Table 6b). Of the 20 responses, 6 were unidentified with respect to a specific target group. Vocational educators were cited by 3 states, special educators by 3 states, regular educators by 4 states, and administrators and "others" by 1 state. Some overlap may have occurred due to states reporting more than one target group receiving inservice training in this area. Special educators received the most inservice training in vocational/special education. Due to a lack of specificity, 16 responses were unidentifiable relative to the target groups being served.

In summary, the states seem to be providing educators and support personnel with a wide array of inservice programs and activities but the target audiences are not commonly identifiable. Only 30 states or approximately 58% of the CSPDs included information about inservice training of vocational educators or inservice training in the area of vocational/career education for educational and support personnel in the states. However, the states could be conducting inservice training activities that are not reported in the CSPDs. Only 5 CSPDs listed with any specificity inservice training content for vocational educators, while only 18 states specified vocational and career education content for special and regular educators. In conclusion, the CSPDs do not reflect that vocational educators are signif-

TABLE 6b

TYPES OF INSERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES PROVIDED TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATORS AND/OR IN THE AREA OF VOCATIONAL/SPECIAL EDUCATION FOR PERSONNEL IN THE STATES

Content	Target Audiences: Unidentified	Special Educators	Regular Educators	Administrators	Support Personnel	Paraprofessionals	Parents and Advocacy Groups	Surrogate Parents	Psychologists	Due Process Officers	Volunteers	Others (SEA, Physicians and Corrections)
Unidentified												1
Career/Vocational/Special Education		6	3	5	4	1						1
Secondary Education for the Handicapped				2	2	1						
Interagency Cooperation		2	1	1								1
Implementation of PL 94-142		1										
Individualized Education Programs		1										
Least Restrictive Environment		1										
Diagnostic Procedures		2										
Program Modification		2										
Instructional Strategies			1	1								
Consultation Skills		1										
Handicapping Conditions			1									

N = 52
n = 30

icantly involved in planning relative to the education of handicapped children and youth. In addition, vocational and career education content is generally not reported to be part of the inservice training provided to special and regular educators in the states.

Incentives for Inservice Trainee Participation

Objective V: Identify the incentives that are used in the states to enhance inservice trainee participation.

7. What incentives are utilized to enhance inservice trainee participation in the states?

The incentives used to enhance inservice trainee participation in the states are presented in Table 7. Also presented are the number of states which indicated a particular incentive, and the percent response which specifies the proportion or percentage of the 52 states and territories that indicated any one of the incentives listed in the table.

Forty-three of the 52 CSPDs indicated at least one incentive used to enhance inservice trainee participation, while 9 states did not list any. Most states listed more than 1 incentive. Academic credit which is provided through colleges, universities, state departments of education, or continuing education units located in local education agencies, was listed in 40 CSPDs and was clearly the most frequently used inservice trainee incentive.

Release time from school related duties was the second most frequently identified incentive. Substitute teachers are often provided when release time is permitted during the course of the school day. Compensation time was frequently cited as an incentive for participation in inservice activities on non-school time.

TABLE 7

INCENTIVES UTILIZED TO ENHANCE INSERVICE TRAINEE PARTICIPATION IN THE STATES

Incentive	Number of States Identified	Percent Response
Academic credit	40	76.92%
Release time	29	55.77%
Certification renewal	25	48.08%
Updating professional skills	24	46.16%
Payment for participation	20	38.46%
Other (i.e., materials, certificates)	19	36.54%
Salary step credit	19	36.54%
Reimbursement of expenses	17	32.69%

N = 52
n = 43

Certification renewal was identified by 48% of the states as an incentive for participation in inservice activities, with a specified number of credits or courses being attached to each inservice activity completed toward certificate renewal. The updating of professional skills, payment for participation, salary step credit, and reimbursement for expenses were less frequently used incentives to enhance the probability of trainee participation in inservice activities.

In summary, the states are using an extensive array of inservice training incentives. Presumably, the incentives equally apply for special,

vocational, and regular educators as reported in the CSPDs. However, in practice, the incentives for a vocational educator may differ from those for a special or regular educator.

Funding

Objective VI: Determine the funding sources for inservice training activities and programs which include vocational/special education content as a primary training component, or in which vocational educators are specifically identified as participants.

8. What are the funding sources for the inservice training programs and activities relative to the education of handicapped children and youth (a) for all education and support personnel in the states, and (b) for programs which include vocational/special education content as a primary training component or for vocational educators who are specifically identified as participants?

The funding sources for the inservice training programs and activities relative to the education of handicapped children and youth are presented in Table 8. Also presented are the numbers of states which indicated a particular funding source, and the percent response which specifies the proportion or percentage of the 52 states that indicated any one of the funding sources listed in the table.

Each of the 52 CSPDs listed at least 1 funding source that was used for all education and support personnel in the states. The CSPDs indicated four primary funding sources for all education and support personnel receiving inservice relative to the education of handicapped children and youth. The major funding sources were: (a) EHA Title VI-Part D, (b) EHA Title VI - Part B, (c) state funds, and (d) other sources that varied from state to state. Seventy-one percent of the 52 CSPD's revealed that the majority of states fund inservice training relative to the education of handicapped children and youth through Education of the Handicapped,

TABLE 8

FUNDING SOURCES FOR THE INSERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES RELATIVE TO THE EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Funding Sources for all Education and Support Personnel in the States

Funding Source	Number of States Identified	Percent Response
EHA Title VI-Part D	37	71.15%
EHA Title VI-Part B	33	63.46%
State funds	30	57.69%
Other Sources (e.g., private, state rehabilitation commissions, vocational education)	29	55.77%
Regional resource centers	16	30.77%
Local funds	15	28.85%
EHA Title VI-Part C	12	23.08%
P.L. 94-142 Flow-through and discretionary Funds	11	21.15%
Institutions of higher education	8	15.39%
Other federal funds	6	11.54%
P.L. 89-313 funds	5	9.62%
P.L. 91-230 - Part D	5	9.62%
Developmental disabilities funds	4	7.69%
EHA Title VI - Part E	4	7.69%

N = 52

FUNDING SOURCES WHICH INCLUDE VOCATIONAL/SPECIAL EDUCATION CONTENT AS A PRIMARY TRAINING COMPONENT OR IN WHICH VOCATIONAL EDUCATORS ARE SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFIED AS PARTICIPANTS IN THE STATES

Funding Source	Number of States Identified	Percent Response
Miscellaneous sources (RRC, Institutions of Higher Education, Office of Special Education)	6	11.54%
EHA Title VI-Part D	5	9.62%
State funds	3	5.77%
EHA Title VI-Part B	2	3.85%

N = 52
n = 10

Title VI - Part D funds, while nearly 64% used Title VI - Part B funds. Several other less frequently used funding sources were also identified. However, most states utilized more than one funding source to provide inservice training activities within their respective states.

Ten of the 52 CSPDs listed funding sources for activities which include vocational/special education content as a primary training component or in which vocational educators are specifically identified as participants. Of these 10, six cited miscellaneous sources which included regional resource centers, institutions of higher education and the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education.

Five states cited EHA Title VI - Part D as a source of funding for inservice training which focuses on vocational and career education. State funds and EHA Title VI - Part B funds are also being utilized by some states for these activities. Some of the states indicated more than one funding source.

In summary, very few states have indicated specific funding sources to finance the inservice training of vocational educators or to finance training which includes vocational/special education content. This was expected since few CSPDs have planned for comprehensive inservice training for vocational educators or for training in vocational and career education content for special and regular educators. One assumption is that vocational education is probably providing most of its own inservice training without the use of EHA funds. Vocational education has a 10% set-aside for the handicapped provided through Public Law 94-482, which can be used in part or totally for personnel training in the states. Nevertheless, special educators need to work more closely with vocational educators not only in

providing needs assessment activities and programs, but also in funding these programs. Cooperative efforts will assist in nonduplication of activities and fiscal efficiency.

Inservice Participants

Objective VII: Identify the number of personnel currently receiving inservice training relative to the education of handicapped children and youth.

9. How many personnel currently receive inservice training relative to the education of handicapped children and youth in the states?

The personnel currently receiving inservice training relative to the education of handicapped children and youth in the states are presented in Table 9. Also presented are the types of inservice training the personnel receive.

Forty-five of the 52 states reported the number of personnel currently receiving inservice training in their states. While the target audiences are for the most part mutually exclusive, the types of training are not. For example, regular classroom teachers are clearly the largest group receiving inservice training under the auspices of the CSPD. However, the teachers who receive awareness training may concurrently receive knowledge, skill practice, and skill application training. The states also did not specify the target audiences for much of the training being given. However, parents and special education teachers received a relatively large amount of training. The data consistently reflect that for most groups, awareness training is most frequently provided, followed by knowledge, skill practice, and skill application training.

TABLE 9

PERSONNEL CURRENTLY RECEIVING INSERVICE TRAINING RELATIVE TO THE EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN AND YOUTH IN THE STATES

Type of Training	Target Audience: Regular Classroom Teachers	Special Education Teachers	Teacher Aides	Parents	Support Personnel (Psychology, social workers, health personnel, physical education)	Administrators	maintenance, transportation, food service) Operations Personnel (secretarial, clerical	Vocational Education Teachers	Counselors	Hearing Officers	University Personnel	Vocational Educators, Physical Educators, Volunteers, Surrogate Parents, Officers, University Personnel, Hearing	Handicapped Consumers	Other	Total
Awareness	313,151	85,577	16,553	142,343	26,868	34,614	15,072	100	760	67	89	1,785	241,955	878,934
Knowledge	272,871	85,371	16,692	112,274	43,567	32,100	11,534	100	60	124	125	1,138	208,490	784,446
Skill Practice	169,723	66,782	10,490	80,004	19,375	16,441	3,548	-	-	107	427	698	1,967	369,562
Skill Application	81, 834	43,396	7,417	33,041	9,961	10,522	3,472	-	-	52	409	10	821	190,935
TOTAL	837,579	281,126	51,152	367,662	99,771	93,677	33,626	200	820	350	1,050	3,631	453,233	2,223,877

N=52
n=45

Most states did not specify vocational educators as a target audience for receiving inservice training. However, it is possible that some states may include vocational education in their definition of "regular" classroom teachers. Therefore, vocational educators may be reflected in some instances under the target audience of regular classroom teachers. However, in practice this may not be the case because vocational teachers are frequently referred to as "applied" or "specialized" educators.

In summary, several groups are apparently receiving various types of inservice training relative to the education of handicapped children and youth, as reflected by the CSPDs. However, based on the data available in the CSPDs, vocational educators are generally not included in inservice training.

Vocational Education Manpower Needs

Objective VIII: Identify the number of additional vocational educators that are currently needed to meet the "free and appropriate public education" requirements under Public Law 94-142.

10. How many additional vocational educators (teachers, work-study coordinators) are currently needed by the states to meet the "free and appropriate public education" requirements under Public Law 94-142?

The additional vocational educators that are currently needed by the states to meet the free and appropriate public education (FAPE) requirements under Public Law 94-142 are presented in Table 10. Twenty-four of the 52 CSPDs reported this data.

TABLE 10

NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATORS THAT ARE CURRENTLY NEEDED BY THE STATES TO MEET THE FREE AND APPROPRIATE PUBLIC EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 94-142

States Reporting Data	States not Reporting Data	Percentage of states Reporting Data	Additional Vocational Personnel Required
24	28	46.15%	4,666

N = 52
n = 24

Twenty-four of the CSPDs indicated that a total of 4,666 additional vocational educators are needed to fulfill the FAPE requirements of Public Law 94-142. However, 28 CSPDs or more than 50% of the states did not report this information. Therefore, the total number of additional vocational educators including both vocational teachers and work-study coordinators should be substantially greater. Based on the available data, there is a relatively high need for additional vocational educators who can work with handicapped children and youth.

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which vocational educators participate and vocational/career education content is present in the Fiscal Year 1980 Comprehensive Systems of Personnel Development of 49 states, the District of Columbia, and two trust territories (Guam and the Virgin Islands). In order to examine the central problem more closely, the following CSPD areas were investigated: participatory input and implementation, needs assessment, preservice training, inservice training, incentives for inservice trainee participation, funding, inservice training participants, and vocational education manpower needs. A 10-item survey-type instrument was developed to answer the research questions and achieve the major objectives of this study. The entire population of 52 states and territories which had State Plans for Special Education with CSPD sections were included in this study. Each of the 52 CSPDs was examined. After the CSPDs were collected from the Council for Exceptional Children and the state CSPD officers, a secondary analysis of the CSPDs was conducted using the survey instrument. The data analysis process included the development of descriptive data tables and a discussion of the findings.

It was not the intent of this study to examine the CSPDs to determine the extent to which states plan for the dissemination and adoption of promising practices, evaluation, and technical assistance to LEAs. Nor was the intent of this study to assess the extent of implementation of the CSPD components or the perceptions of SEA and LEA personnel as to CSPD effectiveness. The findings are based on the major objectives and research

questions that were developed for this study. The general findings of this study were:

1. Higher education personnel, state education agency personnel, and local education agency personnel most frequently serve as members on statewide manpower planning councils or CSPD committees, while representatives from other state agencies including advocacy groups, parents, professional associations, handicapped consumers, and state institution personnel also serve on the committees. However, only 10 of the 52 CSPDs stated that vocational educators or their representatives serve as members on the statewide manpower planning council.

2. CSPD committees and meetings, conferences, or seminars for input in the CSPD were the most commonly used methods of participation in the development, review, refinement, and annual updating of the states' comprehensive systems of personnel development. Field-based task forces, state advisory councils for special education, advisory committees, public hearings, surveys and dissemination systems are additional methods used by the states. However, only 25% of the states have indicated that vocational educators participate in the CSPD process.

3. Ninety percent of the states indicated that surveys to determine LEA priority training needs was a method by which they assess the needs of educators and support personnel relative to the education of handicapped children and youth. Methods including

routine LEA personnel reports, findings from compliance monitoring of LEAs, and study of competencies required of personnel to implement Public Law 94-142 were less frequently indicated. However, only 23% of the states specifically plan for the personnel development of vocational educators.

4. Many states do not specify how paraprofessional, undergraduate and graduate programs use data from needs assessment studies conducted for the CSPD to plan preservice programs. Some CSPDs stated that colleges and universities use the information for developing and maintaining programs and others simply indicated that collaborative efforts between SEAs and institutions of higher education facilitate the use of the needs assessment information.

5. Only 6 of 52 states included in their CSPDs a description of paraprofessional, undergraduate, and graduate preparatory programs in the areas of vocational/special education and/or career preparation. The 6 CSPDs that did include a "description" actually contained only vague statements.

6. A broad spectrum of inservice training content and range of target audiences were identified in the CSPDs. The Individualized Education Program was the most frequently identified inservice training content area within the CSPDs, and special educators and regular educators were the most frequent recipients of inservice training. However, in most instances the target audiences for particular inservice training were not specified.

Similarly, in several CSPDs the content areas for particular target audiences were not specified. According to the CSPDs only 58% of the states plan to any extent for the inservice training of vocational educators, or in the area of vocational and career education content for all education and support personnel, and only 5 states were specific to any extent in their planning for similar inservice training.

7. Academic credit and release time were the most frequently used incentives to enhance inservice trainee participation in the states. Certification renewal, updating professional skills, payment for participation, salary step credit, and reimbursement of expenses were also incentives identified in the CSPDs.

8. Seventy-one percent of the states indicated that EHA Title VI - Part D funds were used to finance the inservice training programs and activities relative to the education of handicapped children and youth. Almost 64% of the states indicated that EHA Title VI - Part B funds were used for this purpose. Several other sources of funding were also listed in the CSPDs. Only 10 of the 52 CSPDs identified specific funding sources used for the inservice training in which vocational/special education content is a primary training component for all education and support personnel, or in which vocational educators were specifically identified as participants.

9. Regular educators are apparently the largest target audience receiving inservice training. Awareness training is most often provided relative to the education of handicapped children and

youth in the states. However, the CSPDs did not specify the target audiences for much of the training being delivered. In addition, vocational educators are not generally specified as a target audience receiving inservice training.

10. Twenty-four of the 52 CSPDs reported data concerning the number of additional vocational educators that are currently needed by the states to meet the free and appropriate public education requirements under Public Law 94-142. Of the 24 states reporting data, 4,666 additional personnel are needed. Presumably, if the other 28 states reported this information, this number would be substantially increased.

Conclusions

The conclusions are based on the findings of this study. They are concerned with participatory input and implementation, needs assessment, preservice training, inservice training, incentives for inservice trainee participation, funding, inservice trainee participants, and vocational education manpower needs.

1. Several different groups, agencies, or organizations are currently participating on statewide manpower planning councils or CSPD committees. However, vocational educators or their representatives are usually not included as a distinct group.

2. There is an extensive array of methods by which various groups annually provide input into the development, review, refinement and updating of the states' CSPDs. However, vocational educators are not generally included and when they are, do not appear to assume active roles.

3. The states are using several different methods by which to assess the needs of educators and support personnel relative to the education of handicapped children and youth. However, the needs of vocational educators are not generally being assessed, and when they are the assessments may not be adequate.

4. The states, according to the CSPDs, are not planning for the effective use of comprehensive needs assessment information for developing, implementing, and evaluating paraprofessional, undergraduate, and graduate programs.

5. The CSPDs do not include a detailed description of paraprofessional, undergraduate, and graduate preparatory programs in the areas of vocational/special education and/or career preparation.

6. A wide array of inservice training content areas are being delivered to several different target audiences, especially regular and special educators. However, the specificity of the content and target audiences is not generally indicated. The delivery of inservice training to vocational educators, or concerning vocational and career education content to other education and sup-

port personnel is not evident in many CSPDs and not specific in nearly all CSPDs.

7. The states are using several different incentives to enhance inservice trainee participation with academic credit the most frequently cited incentive.

8. Several different sources are used to fund the inservice training programs relative to the education of handicapped children and youth, but, EHA Title VI - Parts B and D are most frequently used. However, few CSPDs identify funding sources for in-service training in which vocational/special education content is a primary training component or in which vocational educators are specifically identified as participants.

9. Several different groups are apparently receiving various types of inservice training relative to the education of handicapped children and youth. However, vocational educators are generally not included in the inservice training provided under the CSPD.

10. Based on the available data, a relatively large number (4,666) of additional vocational educators (teachers, work-study coordinators) are currently needed by the states to meet the free and appropriate public education requirements under Public Law 94-142.

Recommendations

The findings and conclusions of this study, which are based on the information provided in the Fiscal Year 1980 CSPDs, suggest that vocational educators and vocational and career education content are not reflected extensively in comprehensive personnel planning in the states relative to the education of handicapped children and youth. Although several significant pieces of federal legislation and initiatives (Public Law 94-142, Public Law 94-482, and USOE-RSA Joint Memorandum) have been developed to enhance interagency cooperation and planning, this analysis of CSPDs suggests that special education and vocational education continue not to coordinate their personnel preparation efforts to any significant extent. However, as funds become more scarce and the need for preparing vocational educators to work with the handicapped increases, the states will have to begin to develop effective strategies for interagency personnel development.

Several general and specific recommendations can be made based on the findings and conclusions of this study. The recommendations which follow are addressed to vocational education and special education policy making, planning, and research personnel at the federal, state, and local levels.

1. Vocational educators (as well as vocational rehabilitation and CETA personnel) need to serve and have an active role on statewide manpower planning councils or CSPD committees in the states. In addition, vocational education personnel should also be active participants in developing and updating the states' comprehensive systems of personnel development. Vocational educators from SEAs including state directors, division heads, supervisors, and consultants are possible participants in CSPD activities. Most states also have a consultant for vocational special needs

education in the state departments of vocational education whose responsibilities commonly entail the monitoring of programs for handicapped learners and supervising or conducting needs assessment and inservice training activities.

Potential participants at the local level may include vocational teachers, supervisors, and coordinators. Professional associations such as the state vocational association and the state associations for vocational education special needs personnel can assist in identifying vocational educators who could serve on state CSPD committees.

State and local vocational education advisory council members and university and college teacher educators are also potential CSPD committee members. State special education leaders, policy-makers, and personnel development planners should become familiar with vocational education groups and organizations and identify appropriate individuals who could actively serve on CSPD committees in their respective states.

2. Vocational educators should be included in the special education needs assessments that are planned and conducted for all educational personnel. Vocational education serves many handicapped learners, especially at the secondary level. Therefore, it is extremely important that vocational educators be included in needs assessment activities regarding handicapped learners. Since the passage of Public Law 94-482, vocational educators in some states have attempted to assess the needs of their personnel primarily at the inservice teacher education level. However, in many such assessments, emphasis is placed on content and facilities and is not centered on learner needs. More comprehensive needs assessment information can be

obtained if vocational and special education work together to assess both the learning environment and the learner.

While planning needs assessment activities, strategies should be developed to identify and combine present needs assessment methods and activities by vocational and special education. Further, individuals should be sought from SEAs (e.g., state directors of vocational education, state consultants for vocational special needs education, and research coordinating unit directors), LEAs (e.g., local directors of vocational education, teachers, and work-study coordinators), and universities and colleges (e.g., vocational special needs teacher educators) who can contribute in the development, implementation, and evaluation of comprehensive needs assessment activities. Comprehensive needs assessment activities must combine assessed needs and the planning for necessary personnel training. Needs assessment information should state not only what is but what should be.

3. Effective planning for the use of needs assessment information for developing and/or revising paraprofessional, undergraduate, and graduate programs needs to occur in the states. In addition, the states should include in their personnel planning the development of programs for paraprofessional, undergraduate, and graduate preservice programs in the areas of vocational/special education and/or career preparation. This is particularly significant since a relatively large number of additional vocational educators (4,666 reported by 24 states) is needed who can work with handicapped learners. It is critical for SEA, LEA, university, and college personnel to work together on developing strategies to utilize needs assessment information. For example, one activity could be to review and evalu-

ate the personnel development sections of the annual state plans for vocational education, special education, vocational rehabilitation, and CETA. Needs assessments are commonly developed and conducted by SEAs and LEAs. However, training programs, particularly preservice programs, usually are developed and delivered by university and college personnel. If these groups do not work collaboratively, the link between identified needs and necessary training will probably not occur. Vocational educators, special educators, and vocational rehabilitation personnel at the university level could hold joint planning meetings and appoint collaborative ad hoc committees for purposes of using available needs assessment information. States need to develop effective strategies for communicating needs assessment information among all participating agencies and then develop procedures for meeting the training needs. Otherwise, the need for preservice and inservice training in vocational/special education may not be realized.

4. Vocational educators need to be included in the special education inservice training which is provided to other educators. The individualized education plan, least restrictive environment, and assessment concepts and ideals apply as much to vocational educators as they do "regular" educators. Putting people "together" in inservice sessions will help them work "together" on a daily basis. Vocational educators should not be expected to provide their own special education training and hope that the student and learning environment will somehow coalesce. In addition, special education inservice planning should more broadly address the needs of secondary educators and progress beyond awareness to more skill application types of training. That is, the content of special education inservice training should

be expanded to include vocational and career education content which is focused on education for work. Presently, many special educators who are practicing in the field are not trained to work with secondary handicapped students. For example, special education teachers may be performing in such roles as prevocational teachers, cooperative work education teachers, or work-study teachers, but their preservice training may have focused on special education at the elementary level. Comprehensive needs assessments of vocational and special education personnel should clearly indicate their needs. It is important for state policy makers and planning personnel to realize the needs and plan accordingly.

5. States should continue to seek appropriate alternatives for enhancing inservice trainee participation. One strategy could be to integrate the identification of incentives into the needs assessment process for vocational and special educators. The individual needs that educators express may be related to specific incentives. It should be noted that the incentives for vocational educators may be different from those for special educators. This may occur because of differences in class settings, certification requirements, or educational and work experiences.

6. Comprehensive state planning for delivering inservice training to all educators relative to the education of handicapped children and youth should focus to the maximum extent possible, on coordinating funds to avoid any unnecessary duplication of effort and thereby increase training efficiency. As federal, state, and local dollars become more scarce, the coordination of funding sources will become increasingly important. Any strategy

for coordinating funding sources should include interagency agreements regarding common purposes and responsibilities, and identification of approaches to cooperative efforts.

7. The CSPD is one indicator of what is planned or may be happening in the states relative to the vocational and career education of handicapped learners. Therefore, future research studies should also examine the state and local plans for vocational education, vocational rehabilitation, CETA, and other public and private agencies to determine the extent to which programs, services, and personnel development activities are being planned and implemented. This kind of analysis will provide a more comprehensive assessment of what the states are planning with respect to personnel development.

The areas of personnel development that were investigated in this study are indeed not mutually exclusive concerning comprehensive personnel preparation and development relative to the education of handicapped learners in the states. For example, the extent to which vocational educators actively participate in the CSPD development process will probably determine the extent to which their needs will be assessed and adequately served through inservice training activities. Needs assessment, preservice and inservice training, inservice trainee incentives, and funding all interface in comprehensive personnel development systems. Needs assessment information is significant to the extent that it is used to determine training activities, incentives, and the funds to support various training activities.

In summary, special education legislation states that vocational education clearly should be an available program for all handicapped students.

Both the vocational and special education legislation encourages interagency cooperative efforts. Further, there are many handicapped learners who are presently unserved and who could benefit from vocational education. Therefore, it is of paramount importance that vocational educators and vocational and career education content be included in comprehensive personnel development planning in the states.

References

Brock, R. J. Preparing Vocational and Special Education Personnel to Work with Special Needs Students: State of Art, 1979. Menomonie: University of Wisconsin-Stout, 1977.

Burrello, L. C. and Baker, K. T. Developing a Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Through a Peer Planning and Dissemination Network. National Inservice Network, Indiana University, Bloomington, 1980.

Clark, G. M. and Evans, R. N. Preparing Vocational and Special Education Personnel to Work with Special Needs Students: A State of the Art in 1977. In Albright, L. and Clark, G. M. Preparing Vocational and Special Education Personnel to Work with Special Needs Students: A Teacher Education Resource Guide. Urbana: Bureau of Educational Research, University of Illinois, 1977.

Federal Register, Vocational Education, Volume 42, Number 67, April 7, 1977.

Federal Register, Nondiscrimination on Basis of Handicap, Volume 42, Number 86, May 4, 1977. (Regulations for Implementing Section 504 of Public Law 93-112).

Federal Register, Education of Handicapped Children, Volume 42, Number 163, August 23, 1977. (Regulations for Implementing Public Law 94-142).

Federal Register, Position statement on Comprehensive Vocational Education for Handicapped Persons, Volume 43, Number 186, September 25, 1978.

Greenan, J. P. and Phelps, L. A. Policy-Related Problems for Delivering Vocational Education to Handicapped Learners as Perceived by State Education Agency Personnel. Urbana, Illinois. Leadership Training Institute/Vocational and Special Education, 1980.

Horn, W. A. and Cave, O. A Review of Selected Inservice Training Components of States' 1979-80 Annual Program Plans. Council for Exceptional Children, Reston, Virginia, 1980.

Howard, R. Vocational Education of Handicapped Youth: State of the Art. Washington, D. C.: National Association of State Boards of Eduction, 1979.

Interim Report to Congress. Progress Toward a Free Appropriate Public Education: Semi-annual Update on the Implementation of Public Law 94-142: The Education for All Handicapped Children Act. U.S.

Office of Education, Division of Assistance to States, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Washington, D. C., 1979.

National Association for Vocational Education Special Needs Personnel. 1980 Edition of the Teacher Education Directory: Vocational Special Needs Personnel. University of Northern Colorado, NAVESNP, 1980.

Phelps, L. A. and Thornton, L. J. Vocational Education and Handicapped Learners: Perceptions and Inservice Needs of State Leadership Personnel. Urbana, Illinois: Leadership Training Institute/Vocational and Special Education, 1979.

Rude, C. R. State Inservice Training Plans: What is and What Could Be. Council for Exceptional Children, 1978 (Unpublished).

Schofer, R. C. and Duncan, J. R. Statewide Cooperative Manpower Planning in Special Education: A Second Status Study. University of Missouri, Columbia, 1978.

Schofer, R. C. and Duncan, J. R. A National Survey of Comprehensive Systems of Personnel Development: A Third Status Study. University of Missouri, Columbia, 1980.

University of New Mexico. Consumer's Guide for Personnel Preparation Programs: The Training of Professionals in Vocational Education for the Handicapped. Chicago: Chicago Instructional Dynamics, Inc., 1978.

Appendix

APPENDIX A

CSPD Survey

State: _____

Page No.

1. What groups, agencies, or organizations serve as members on the statewide manpower planning council (CSPD Committee) or its equivalent in this state?

_____ _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Do vocational educators or their representatives, such as professional organizations or related agencies serve as members on the statewide manpower planning council? _____

YES_____ NO_____

State: _____

Page No.

2. To what extent do individuals from the groups, agencies or organizations participate in the development, review, refinement, and annual updating of this state's comprehensive system of personnel development? _____

_____ a CSPD Committee

_____ advisory committees other than a State CSPD committee

_____ State's Advisory Committee on Public Law 94-142

_____ public hearings

_____ field-based task forces whose purpose is to develop or review particular aspects of CSPD

_____ surveys or questionnaires

_____ meetings, conferences, or seminars for input into the CSPD

_____ provide information through existing dissemination systems

_____ other _____

_____

_____

_____ none

Do individuals affiliated with vocational education also participate by providing input into this state's comprehensive system of personnel development? _____

YES _____ NO _____

State: _____

Page No. _____

3. Does this SEA assess the needs of educators and support personnel relative to the education of handicapped children and youth?

YES_____ NO_____

If yes, how are their needs assessed?

_____ surveys to determine LEA priority personnel needs

_____ data on numbers and qualification of graduates of personnel training programs

_____ study of competencies required of personnel to implement Public Law 94-142

_____ personnel projections from LEA applications for Public Law 94-142

_____ routine LEA personnel reports

_____ analysis of child find and census data to determine changing student needs

_____ findings from compliance monitoring of LEAs

_____ other, please specify

_____

_____

_____

_____

Does this SEA also assess the needs of vocational educators relative to the education of handicapped children and youth?

YES_____ NO_____

State: _____

Page No. _____

4. Do the paraprofessional, undergraduate, and graduate programs respond to the preservice training needs identified through systematic needs assessments conducted by this state?

YES ____ NO ____

If yes, to what extent?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

State: _____

Page No.

5. Does this state's CSPD include a description of paraprofessional, undergraduate, and graduate preparatory programs in the areas of vocational/special education and/or career preparation? _____

YES ____ NO ____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

State: _____

Page No.

6. What is the nature and extent (e.g., focus, content, time-lines) of the inservice training initiatives relative to the education of handicapped children and youth for educators and support personnel in this state? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

What is the nature and extent of the inservice training initiatives for vocational educators and/or in the area of vocational/special education for personnel in this state? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

State: _____

Page No.

7. What are the incentives utilized to enhance inservice trainee participation in this state? _____

_____ academic credit
_____ release time
_____ payment for participation
_____ salary-step credit
_____ certification renewal
_____ updating professional skills
_____ substitute teachers
_____ reimbursement of expenses
_____ other

_____
_____
_____
_____

State: _____

Page No.

8. What are the funding sources for the inservice training programs relative to the education of handicapped children and youth for all education and support personnel in this state? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

What are the funding sources for the inservice training activities and/or programs which include vocational/special education content as a primary training component or in which vocational educators are specifically identified as participants in this state? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

State: _____

Page No. _____

9 How many personnel within each of the following groups currently receive inservice training relative to the education of handicapped children and youth in this state?

Target Audience / Type of Training	Vocational Teachers			Special Education Teachers		Regular Educators	Guidance Counselors	Administrators		Support Personnel	Teacher Aides	Operations Personnel	Parents	Advocates	Other	Total
	Elementary	Secondary	Cooperative Work-Study Coordinators	Elementary	Secondary			Vocational Education	Special Education							
										psychology, social workers, health personnel, physical education		secretarial, clerical, maintenance, transportation, food service				
Awareness																
Knowledge																
Skill Practice																
Skill Application																
TOTAL																

State: _____

Page No.

10. How many additional vocational educators (teachers, work-study coordinators) are currently needed by this state to meet the "Free and Appropriate Public Education" requirements under Public Law 94-142? _____

_____